Remarks:

Claims 1-40 are now in the application. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-19 have been amended. Claims 22-40 are new.

In item 1 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to the specification as containing trademarks but not clearly delineating them. *See* MPEP § 608.01(v). The specification has been amended to put the trademarks in all caps and to include the ® symbol to show that they are registered trademarks. Accordingly, the requirements of MPEP § 608.01(v) are met.

In item 2 of the Office action, the Examiner noted that claims 15-19 failed to meet the standards of 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. More particularly, the Examiner argued that the claims were not properly written means plus function claims. Claims 15-19 have been amended to further clarify that the claims are not means plus function claims. The amended claims clarify that parts are program modules within the computer system that are performing the steps. The amendments to claims 15-19 are neither provided for the statutory requirements of a patent nor for reasons relating to the prior art.

In item 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 as being unpatentable over Jaeger '290 in view of Farrah '997 under 35 USC § 103(a). The claims have been amended to distinguish the invention from the references. Support for the amendments to claim 1, 8, and 15 can be found in the specification in paragraph 00013 and 00032. Claim 1 as amended now describes, *inter alia*, a method of entering a presentation into a computer that includes the following steps:

> in case one object grid line of the set of object grid lines of the one of the graphical objects is not positioned on one of the container grid lines: generating a movable additional container grid line for the container at the current position of the one object grid line, and binding of the one object grid line to the movable additional container grid line. (Emphasis added by Applicant.)

According to the amended claims, the additional container grid line is movable. Movable additional container grid lines enables automatic layout by using a constraint solver; *see* paragraphs 00015, 00036, and 00037. Claims 22-33 and 35-40 describe ways that the constraint solver works

with the bound grid lines and constrains to automate the layout process in ways that are not taught or suggested in the prior art.

In contrast to the invention as claimed, Jaeger shows a snap to grid function (cf. paragraph 0061). However, the graph object is not bound to the grid. The gridlines are not movable except by globally adjusting the spacing between the grid-less (cf. steps 209 and 210 in Fig. 23). When the gridline spacing is changed, the position of the previously positioned graphic objects remains the same. The graphic object itself does not have gridlines. Thus, the system shown in Jaeger cannot be used for automatic layout by using a constraint solver.

Likewise, according to Farrah '997, the graphic objects do have gridlines. While additional gridlines can be generated when an object is added (*see* paragraph 0233), the additional gridlines only depend on the size and position of the additional object. In particular, all of the gridlines in Farrah '997 are fixed once they have been created and are not movable with respect to each other. Therefore, the approach taught by Farrah '997 does not suggest usage of a constraint solver for automatic layout.

Claim 34 describes a plug-in computer program that works with a general-purpose presentation program. This type of plug-in computer program is not taught in the prior art. Support for claim 34 can be found in the specification in paragraphs 00016 and 00021.

Because the prior art does not teach a method for automatic layout of graphical objects that utilizes movable grid lines bound to objects having grid lines along with constraints, the invention as claimed is patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion:

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If any questions remain regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

A payment of $950 to provide for an additional nineteen claims is provided.

No additional fee is believed due. However, please charge any required fee (or credit any overpayments of fees) to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Account No. 500601 (Docket No. 7390-X04-029).

Respectfully submitted,

/Loren D. Pearson/

Loren Donald Pearson, Reg. No. 42,987
Martin Fleit, Reg. No. 16,900

Customer Number: 27317

FLEIT KAIN GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO
21355 East Dixie Highway, Suite 115
Miami, Florida 33180
Tel: 305-830-2600; Fax: 305-830-2605
e-mail: LPearson@FocusOnIP.com